

**From:** [llegere@timeshamrock.com](mailto:llegere@timeshamrock.com)  
**Sent:** 4/20/2012 5:39:51 PM

**To:** "Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA" <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov>  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Arsenic level in HW47

Hi Roy,  
I sent the messages below to Terri, but perhaps you can respond.  
Thanks,  
Laura

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Laura Legere** <[llegere@timeshamrock.com](mailto:llegere@timeshamrock.com)>  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 20, 2012 at 5:19 PM  
**Subject:** Arsenic level in HW47  
**To:** Terri-A White <[White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov)>

Hi Terri,  
Sorry - one more thing. I just saw the arsenic level in HW47 (90 ug/L). Does the EPA consider this a health threat? Can you tell me if this home has an alternate source of drinking water?

Thanks,  
Laura Legere  
Staff Writer

Scranton Times-Tribune

570-348-9100 x 5184

[llegere@timeshamrock.com](mailto:llegere@timeshamrock.com)

Hi Terri,

Does the EPA plan to do additional testing at any of these 16 wells based on the first results? Also, Cabot reiterated its statement from the last round that "EPA did not indicate that those contaminants that were detected bore any relationship to oil and gas development in the Dimock area." I just wanted to check that what Roy told me last time -- that "EPA has not done any detailed review to determine the cause" and that "Once all of the sample results are complete, we will conduct a comprehensive review to determine if there are any trends or patterns in the data as it relates to home well water quality" -- is still accurate.